

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
on  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: ZAPPOS.COM, INC., CUSTOMER DATA  
SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION

MDL No. 2357

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

**CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO -1)**

On June 13, 2012, the Panel transferred 6 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the District of Nevada for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407. *See F.Supp.2d\_* (J.P.M.L. 2012). Since that time, no additional action(s) have been transferred to the District of Nevada. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Robert Clive Jones.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the District of Nevada and assigned to Judge Jones.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. §1407 to the District of Nevada for the reasons stated in the order of June 13, 2012, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Robert Clive Jones.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

Inasmuch as no objection is  
pending at this time, the  
stay is lifted.

Jul 06, 2012

CLERK'S OFFICE  
UNITED STATES  
JUDICIAL PANEL ON  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

FOR THE PANEL:



Jeffery N. Lüthi  
Clerk of the Panel

**IN RE: ZAPPOS.COM, INC., CUSTOMER DATA  
SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2357

**SCHEDULE CTO-1 – TAG-ALONG ACTIONS**

**DIST      DIV.      C.A.NO.      CASE CAPTION**

CALIFORNIA NORTHERN

CAN      3      12-03131      Nobles v. Zappos.Com, Inc.